

REMARKS

In accordance with the foregoing, claims 8-14 are amended. No new matter is being presented, and approval and entry are respectfully requested.

Claims 1-5 and 7-15 are pending and under consideration. Reconsideration is respectfully requested.

Entry Of Response Under 37 C.F.R. §1.116:

Claims 8, 10, 12, and 14 are amended herein to replace the phrase "computer-readable medium" with --computer-readable storage medium--. Support for the amendment is found for example, on page 5, lines 18-21.

Claim 9 is amended herein to recite a computer network including a "plurality of processing terminals; a dispatcher . . . , and a queue manager." Claims 11 and 13 are similarly amended. Support for the amendment is found for example, on pages 7-8 starting at line 17.

Claim 13 is amended to correct an informality and replace phrase "computer network transmission medium" with --computer network-- to correspond to parent claim 9.

Applicants request entry of this Rule §116 Response and Request for Reconsideration because:

- (a) it is believed that the amendment of claims 8-14 puts this application into condition for allowance;
- (b) the amendment of claims 8-14 should not entail any further search by the Examiner since no new features are being added or no new issues are being raised; and/or
- (c) the amendments do not significantly alter the scope of the claims and place the application at least into a better form for appeal.

The Manual of Patent Examining Procedures sets forth in §714.12 that "[a]ny amendment that would place the case either in condition for allowance or in better form for appeal may be entered." (Underlining added for emphasis). Moreover, §714.13 sets forth that "[t]he Proposed Amendment should be given sufficient consideration to determine whether the claims are in condition for allowance and/or whether the issues on appeal are simplified." The Manual of Patent Examining Procedures further articulates that the reason for any non-entry should be explained expressly in the Advisory Action.

Page 2: Rejection of claims 9, 11, 13, 15 under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph

On page 2 of the Office Action, the Examiner rejects claims 9, 11, 13, 15 under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, as being indefinite. The Examiner asserts claims 9 and 11:

failed to point out any elements of the claimed computer network. Claims merely

describe a multi channel control method.

(Action at page 2).

Claim 9 is amended herein to recite a computer network including a "plurality of processing terminals; a dispatcher . . . , and a queue manager." Claim 11 is similarly amended.

Applicants submit that claims 9 and 11 (and respective dependent claims 13 and 15) comply with 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph and request the rejection be withdrawn.

Page 3: Rejection of claims 8, 10, 12, 14 under 35 U.S.C. §101 as directed to non-statutory subject matter.

On page 3 of the Office Action, the Examiner rejects claims 8, 10, 12, 14 under 35 U.S.C. §101 as directed to non-statutory subject matter. The Examiner asserts:

Applicant does not limit the computer readable medium to only storage media (i.e. no transmission signal media allowed in this category).

(Action at page 3).

Claims 8, 10, 12, 14 are amended herein to replace the phrase "computer-readable medium" with --computer-readable storage medium--.

Applicants submit that claims 8, 10, 12, 14 comply with 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph and request the rejection be withdrawn.

Pages 4-8: Rejection Of Claims 1-5, 7-15 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by Dilip et al. (U.S.P. 6,704,409)

On pages 4-8 of the Office Action, the Examiner rejects claims 1-5, 7-15 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by newly-cited art Dilip et al. (U.S.P. 6,704,409).

The rejection is traversed.

As set forth in MPEP §706.02 entitled Rejection on Prior Art, anticipation requires that the reference must teach every aspect of a claimed invention. Dilip does not support an anticipatory-type rejection by not describing features recited in the present application's independent claims.

I. Dilip does not teach, for example, a "determining" as recited in independent claims 1, 2, 8, and 9

Independent claim 1 recites a multi-channel processing control device ". . . accepting a plurality of process requests from a plurality of channels as communication means between a user and call center, and determining whether any of the plurality of process requests from the plurality of channels are real-time process requests needing processing in real-time, or non-real-time process requests not needing processing in real-time, the determining based on an indication of properties of a channel that generates said process requests and based on

services in a queue category; . . . changing processing requests among processing requests determined to be the non-real-time processing requests to the real-time processing requests when data relating to clients as processing objects is predetermined client data, and for administrating other non-real-time processing requests with priority levels therefore; . . . allocating process requests determined to be real-time process requests to processing terminals that are currently available among a plurality of processing terminals connected to a plurality of channels capable of a real-time process; and. . . allocating non-real-time processes administrated by said non-real-time processing administrating means to any of the processing terminals, said allocation performed with consideration given to the priority level and to suitability of the terminal for handling the process." (Emphasis added). Independent claims 2, 8, and 9 have similar recitations.

Applicants submit that Dilip does not teach any such a "determining" in the lines cited by the Examiner, or anywhere else.

The Examiner asserts that Dilip teaches a method "determining whether any of the plurality of process requests from the plurality of channels are real-time process requests . . . , or non-real-time process requests . . . , the determining based on an indication of properties of a channel that generates said process requests and based on services in a queue category" citing Dilip col. 2, lines 24-48 col. 3, lines 48-67; col. 4, lines 5-26; lines 55-67; col. 6, lines 29-38; col. 7, lines 42-65; col. 11, lines 27-62; col. 12, lines 20-38. (Action at pages 4-5).

However, Applicants submit that by contrast, Dilip merely teaches (see, for example, col. 3, lines 50-65):

A real-time transaction is a transaction in which signals are communicated between a transaction initiator (e.g., a customer) and an agent with relatively short time intervals between the termination of one transmission and the start of the next. Examples of real-time transactions include telephone calls, videoconferences, and Internet sessions (including Internet phone calls). A non-real time transaction is a transaction in which significant time may elapse (e.g., several hours) between the termination of one transmission and the start of the next. Examples of non-real-time transactions include e-mail messages, voice mail messages, and facsimile transmissions.

and (see, for example, col. 11, lines 33-42):

The priority of a particular transaction may be determined by various parameters and other configuration information set by the user or administrator of the system. For example, a particular agent or group of agents may be designated as high priority . . . Alternatively, a particular type of transaction may be designated as high priority.

That is, by contrast, Dilip teaches a determination of a real-time or non-real time based merely on a type of message and with a further assignment of priorities and does not teach a

determining based on "properties of a channel that generates said process requests and based on services in a queue category."

II. Dilip does not teach, for example, an "allocating" as recited in independent claims 4, 10, and 11.

Independent claim 4 recites a multi-channel processing control method for processing terminals handled by operators processing incoming tasks and processing terminals handled by operators processing outgoing tasks, at least one of the operators being a dual-duty operator capable of processing either incoming tasks or outgoing tasks including "allocating the processing terminal handled by said dual-duty operator to either incoming tasks or outgoing tasks based on a current status of the processing terminals handled by the operators, wherein said incoming tasks and outgoing tasks include both real-time and non-real-time process requests arising from channels connected to, in addition to the processing terminals handled by said operators, Web agents handling process requests generated by Internet web servers, e-mail agents handling process requests generated by e-mail servers, and automatic voice response devices automatically processing incoming signals from public lines." (emphasis added). Independent claims 10-11 have similar recitations.

Applicants submit that that Dilip does not teach such an "allocating" in the lines cited by the Examiner, or anywhere else

The Examiner asserts Dilip teaches "allocating the processing terminal handled by said dual-duty operator to either incoming tasks or outgoing tasks based on a current status of the processing terminals handled by the operators" citing col. 3, lines 48-67; col. 4, lines 5-26; lines 55-67; col. 6, lines 29-38; col. 7, lines 42-65; col. 11, lines 27-62; col. 12, lines 20-38. (Action at page 6).

However, Applicants submit that Dilip merely teaches (see, for example, col. 5, lines 2-21):

each agent has a computer system and a telephone (which may be integrated into the computer system), such that the agent is capable of handling and responding to multiple types of transactions (e.g., telephone calls, e-mail, voice mail, and facsimiles).

and (see, for example, col. 7 lines 42-54):

The agent receives the highest priority transaction each time the agent becomes available (i.e., logs into the system or completes the previous transaction), regardless of the transaction type.

That is, Dilip merely teaches assignment of a task when an agent is available and does not teach an allocation of the processing terminal to either incoming tasks or outgoing tasks.

Summary

Since features recited by each of the independent claims 1, 2, 4, 8-11 (and respective dependent claims) are not taught by the cited art, the rejection should be withdrawn and claims 1-5 and 7-15 allowed.

CONCLUSION

There being no further outstanding objections or rejections, it is submitted that the application is in condition for allowance. An early action to that effect is courteously solicited.

If there are any formal matters remaining after this response, the Examiner is requested to telephone the undersigned to attend to these matters.

If there are any additional fees associated with filing of this Amendment, please charge the same to our Deposit Account No. 19-3935.

Respectfully submitted,

STAAS & HALSEY LLP

Date: November 13, 2006

By: Paul W. Bobowiec
Paul W. Bobowiec
Registration No. 47,431

1201 New York Ave, N.W., 7th Floor
Washington, D.C. 20005
Telephone: (202) 434-1500
Facsimile: (202) 434-1501